DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 193 FL 021 953

AUTHOR Scott, Mary Lee
TITLE A Look at TEFL in Russia and Ukraine.
PUB DATE [93]
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audiovisual Aids; College Faculty; Communicative Competence (Languages); *Educational Environment; Educational Technology; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); *Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Instructional Improvement; Instructional Materials; Language Teachers; Native Speakers; Peer Relationship; Second Language Instruction; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Authentic Materials; *Russia; *Ukraine

ABSTRACT

A survey of 53 teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL) in Russia and Ukraine, conducted in May 1992, investigated current teaching conditions and methods and perceived needs and concerns. The teachers taught at elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels; a majority taught in teacher training institutions. Over half the respondents reported using communicative methods, while almost a third used traditional methods; a quarter used both. The activities teachers used frequently appeared to reflect primarily a traditional approach, although they reported using a number of communicative activities as well. The most pressing needs identified by the teachers included authentic materials, contact with native speakers of English, and audiovisual equipment. Almost half the teachers expressed a desire to improve their teaching methodology, while nearly a third indicated a desire for increased contact with colleagues, both locally and nationally. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 368 193

Author: Mary Lee Scott
Affiliation: Brigham Young University
Address: Linguistics Department
3184 JKHB
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
USA
Telephone: (801) 378-5353
Fax: (801) 378-4649
E-mail address: marylee_scott@byu.edu

Title: A Look at TEFL in Russia and Ukraine

Abstract:

This article reports the results of a survey of 53 EFL teachers, mostly from Russia and Ukraine, conducted in May, 1992. The purpose of the survey was to discover current teaching conditions and methods, as well as perceived needs and concerns. Over half of the teachers reported using communicative methods, while almost a third mentioned traditional methods; a quarter reported using both methods. The activities teachers indicated they used frequently appeared to reflect primarily a traditional approach, although they reported using a number of communicative activities as well. The most pressing needs identified by the teachers included lack of authentic materials, contact with native speakers of English, and audio-visual equipment. Almost half of the teachers indicated a desire to improve their teaching methodology, while nearly a third expressed a desire for increased contact with colleagues locally and nationally.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary Lee Scott
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL021953

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mary Lee Scott, Brigham Young University

A Look at TEFL in Russia and Ukraine[1]

As a result of recent political changes in the former Soviet Union, there is a greatly increased interest in English as a foreign language. While EFL was taught in various institutions throughout the Soviet period, it is only recently that EFL teachers there have had significant contact with colleagues in other nations. This article reports the results of a survey of EFL teachers, mostly from Russia and Ukraine, conducted in May, 1992. The purpose of the survey was to discover current teaching conditions and methods, as well as perceived needs and concerns.

Procedure

The survey instrument was developed in the spring of 1992 and reviewed by two Russian EFL teachers residing in the U.S. A revised version (see Appendix A) was administered to EFL teachers at two locations in Russia, (Moscow and Barnaul, Siberia), and one in Ukraine (Kiev). The survey was completed by 53 EFL teachers attending conferences and seminars jointly sponsored by the U.S. Information Agency and the newly formed Russian Association of Teachers of American English Language, Literature, and Culture. It is important to note that because of the small size and limited nature of this sample (i.e., respondents were selected on the basis of their availability and willingness to complete the survey), it is possible to claim that the survey results are unquestionably representative of the majority of TEFL teachers in the former Soviet Union. However, it is felt that the data collected offer valuable insights into the current state of EFL teaching in this region.[2]

The first section of the survey called for basic demographic information, followed by questions regarding the type of institution where the teacher was employed (#1)[3], the role of the department within that institution (#2), the degree/s students were pursuing (#3) and average class size (#4). A subsequent question (#5) attempted to discover the relative emphasis on language skills

and components in EFL courses.[4] A large number of different activities were then listed in an attempt to discover what teachers are actually doing in the classroom (#6), and in a follow-up question (#7) respondents were given the opportunity to add activities not included in the previous question. Respondents were questioned regarding their general methodology or approach to language teaching (#8), and the means used to evaluate student progress (#9). They were given an opportunity to indicate what they felt to be strengths in their courses (#10), and finally to suggest areas needing improvement (#11) and challenges faced by EFL teachers in their country (#12-13).

A set of categories for summarizing the responses to the open-ended items (#1-4 and 7-13) were developed, based on a general reading of responses. Individual responses were then analyzed according to these categories by two raters, according to the following procedure: After categorizing the responses individually, the raters met and came to an agreement on those responses where categorizations differed. Frequencies of responses in each category were obtained and are presented in the tables below.

Results and Discussion

Almost two-thirds of the survey respondents were from Russia (n=33, 62.6%), while just over a third (n=18, 34%) were from Ukraine, as can be noted in Table 1. Even though data were collected at only the three sites mentioned above, a number of the teachers attending the conferences were from cities in other regions of Russia and Ukraine; in addition, there was one respondent each from Kazakhstan and Belorussia.

(Insert Table 1 about here)

A majority of respondents (n=37, 69.8%) taught at pedagogical institutes. These institutions typically train teachers in a variety of fields to teach at the primary/secondary level, although some

also train university level teachers.

Nearly twenty percent of the respondents (n=10, 18.9%) taught at primary/secondary schools. Although these are usually separate institutions in the U.S. educational system, the category is listed here with a slash because the responses indicated that children from ages 6-17 attended this type of school in the Soviet Union.

University teachers accounted for a little over 11% of the respondents (n=8, 11.3%) and three percent of the respondents (n=2, 3.8%) taught at an Academy of Sciences. Such academies typically teach ESP to post-graduates, students working on PhDs, or professionals who return periodically for language refresher courses. In this context teachers often tailor one-on-one courses to a specialist's particular field of interest. Specialists may enroll in short-term courses prior to attending international conferences.

Most teachers in the survey reported working with undergraduate students[5], with about two-thirds involved in training public school teachers to teach EFL, while approximately ten percent trained interpreters and translators. (Only a small percentage were engaged in training university-level foreign language FL teachers.) Additionally, roughly ten percent taught EFL to university students majoring in other subjects. A little over fifteen percent were involved in teaching EFL to children, while just under ten percent taught in adult education or post graduate ESP programs. (See Tables 2 and 3.)[6]

(Insert Tables 2 and 3 about here)

A majority of language classes (90.6%) were fairly small by U.S. standards, generally containing fewer than 15 students; about a fourth of the classes (24.5%) contained from 16-30 students. Classes with more than 30 students were relatively infrequent (9.4%), and teachers

sometimes labeled the larger classes "lecture" courses, where it was assumed there was less opportunity for interaction.

A summary of the methods used by the respondents is displayed in Table 4.[7] A little over half of the teachers (55.3%) indicated that they employed communicative methods, and almost a third (31.6%) mentioned using traditional methods. These were not mutually exclusive categories, and many respondents mentioned using more than one method; the responses which mentioned using more than one method were summarized under the label "Eclectic."[8] A number of other methods were mentioned, as can be seen in Table 4. Unfortunately, because respondents were not offered a checklist as they were regarding activities used in class (#6), it cannot be assumed that they don't use a particular method just because they failed to mention it.

(Insert Table 4 about here)

Deciphering what these categories actually *mean* is a challenge. In order to shed some light on this, representative comments by the respondents regarding the nature of what they consider traditional and communicative methods are presented.

Regarding traditional methods, teachers made the following comments:

> We teach them how to arrange a conversation or a discussion. What we start with is memorizing dialogues, monologues, structures, patterns. On listening comprehension the assignments are as follows: listen, listen for main ideas.
>
> primary/secondary school teacher

> Traditional methods are supposed to have teaching divided into 4 aspects: oral practice, grammar, home and individual reading and phonetics. Teaching grammar is based on explaining certain grammar rules, some practice (exercises, role plays and so on).
>
> pedagogical institute teacher

Selected comments regarding communicative methods are as follows:

> During my <u>conversation</u> classes I use mostly communicative methods of teaching (debates,

class discussions, small group work, simulations, language games, brainstorming...) During newspaper analysis we do a lot of listening (radio and TV news), we discuss articles and news items (class, small-group and one-on-one teacher-student discussions); use scanning and skimming, do translations ([English-Russian, Russian-English], oral)...

pedagogical institute teacher

I teach different aspects of English (grammar, vocabulary, phonetics, etc.) through dialogs on the basis of various situations. And according to this, I try to use the materials (tapes, video, books, exercises) from the point of view of communication. Try to intensify the activities of students at the lessons.

primary/secondary school teacher

The following comment contrasts traditional and communicative approaches:

The textbooks available make us use a combination of the traditional method (involving text retelling, translation, and learning by heart, drills) and the communicative method (involving language games, role plays, communicative grammatical activity).

teacher at an academy of science

Several teachers expressed frustration as they tried to incorporate elements of both communicative and traditional methods in their teaching, as evidenced by the following comments in response to Questions 10 (What do you feel are the greatest strengths of your EFL course?) and 13 (What other challenges does an EFL teacher face in your country?):

Frankly speaking, I'm not satisfied with what I'm doing at present. We are in a state of a bit unnatural combination of the traditional and communicative methods, which makes the whole process a little chaotic. Introduction of the communicative approach (which is as a rule associated with everyday vocabulary) is made difficult by the practical aims of our students, which [include] mastering professional language...

teacher at an academy of science

Generally, the iron curtain was good for developing teaching skills in Russia. Nobody could dream of learning a foreign language in the country where it is spoken, and the system of teaching English "at home" was worked out. Teachers of the old school are terribly strict about grammar and exactness, and their students never make a mistake--this is our strong point. Though younger teachers are different and rely more on natural ways of acquiring language skills, which makes teaching and learning much more fun, but then we lose in exactness.

university teacher

A number of teachers mentioned using the "intensive" method. Considered by its proponents to be a communicative method (Ignatova,[9] personal communication), it is based on the principles

of suggestopedia outlined by Lozanov (Lozanov, 1978; Lozanov & Gateva, 1988). A number of Russian experts, among them, Galina Kitaigorodskaya (Moscow), Marina Mayorova (Moscow), Tamara Ignatova (Moscow), and Valentina Inozemtseva (Irkutsk), have developed versions of the intensive method. (A description of this method is beyond the scope of this report.)

Following are comments regarding the methods used by primary/secondary school teachers:

> Motivating children to learn English: role plays, drama, language games, songs. We have a pupil's English drama theatre at school, "Little Crane." Children from 6-15 years old take part in it. We like our English theatre very much. The foreign language is presented to them through their own activities and games.

> I play a lot with children, we learn many poems and songs in English, do some drama (stage fairy tales).

> I would like to tell you about the work with the text. First, I show the illustration for the text and ask children to guess what the text is about. Then I give the list of new words which they'll meet in the text and give the explanation in English or (choose) ask them to choose a word similar in meaning among three or four words. Then we discuss the title of the text and children try to explain what problems are in the text. Then they read it once. And I give the comprehension questions, they discuss [the] questions. Then they work in groups under some items. At home they usually do individual work (interview, survey, essay).

The top twelve[10] specific activities respondents reported using *very often* in class are shown in Table 5. It is interesting to note that approximately half of the activities, teacher-student drills, correcting homework, pronunciation drills, translation work, and student-to-student drills, appear to correspond to what might be labeled traditional methods, such as the audiolingual method and the grammar translation method. Depending on the nature of the tasks assigned, pair work could be carried out in either a traditional or a communicative fashion, as could work organized around reading fiction. The remaining three activities--free conversation, small group work, and class discussion--could probably be characterized as reflecting a more communicative methodology.

(Insert Table 5 about here)

Table 6 shows the top thirteen activities which teachers indicated they used *regularly*. Here greater consensus is found among the respondents, with two-thirds to just under half marking the same activities. With the possible exceptions of review of previous material (used in most methods) and class discussion, the activities listed appear to overwhelmingly represent more traditional methods.

(Insert Table 6 about here)

Activities used *occasionally* are ranked in Table 7, revealing a much greater number of communicative activities, though some may be used with either a traditional or communicative approach. (Again it is interesting to note that from just under 40% to close to 60% of the respondents marked these activities.) With the exception of mechanical grammar drills and teacher lectures, most of the activities listed seem to reflect a more communicative approach. While one-on-one teacher-student exchanges, in-class competition, language games, songs and the reading activities (silent reading, skimming, and reading non-fiction) could be used with both traditional and communicative methods, drama, free writing, debates, brainstorming, and cooperative learning projects seem to be clearly communicative.

(Insert Table 7 about here)

Finally, Table 8 displays the ten activities which were most frequently listed as *never* being used in the classroom. A number of teachers indicated in their comments (#7) that they were unfamiliar with the terms *dialog journal, semantic mapping, peer feedback, and cloze exercises.*

It may be assumed that teachers might also have been unfamiliar with what was meant by *quick writing* as well.

(Insert Table 8 about here)

Teachers listed additional activities beyond those included in our checklist (#7). Five teachers mentioned using films, video, and TV. The following activities were mentioned by two teachers (each): using English proverbs and idioms, making text summaries, studying history, describing pictures, using vocabulary-crossword puzzles, and interacting with natives. Interestingly, two teachers mentioned engaging in correspondence with the teacher, indicating perhaps a type of dialog journal situation though they didn't label it as such. Most of these additional activities appear to be more reflective of an emphasis on communication.

As for procedures used for student assessment (#9), all teachers reported employing some type of test or exam (see Table 9). Term and research papers were used by a little over half the respondents, with essays and compositions mentioned by an additional 25%. Methods of evaluation listed by less than ten percent of the respondents included competitions, story retelling, acting, multiple choice, taking notes on lectures, planning sessions and analyzing and reasoning.

(Insert Table 9 about here)

The comments made by teachers regarding what they considered the greatest strengths of their EFL courses are summarized in Table 10. Over half of the respondents reported satisfaction with their methods and courses, and an additional twenty percent mentioned activities used in language teaching. Outstanding teacher qualities (enthusiasm, skill, and desire to try new things)

were mentioned by over half the respondents, while approximately a quarter praised students.

(Insert Table 10 about here)

Following are teacher comments which may further illustrate the categories presented in Table 10:

> I do not think one can term our modest achievements as "the greatest strengths." But if some of my students display critical thinking and can express their ideas in a more or less correct way, I am glad.
>
> pedagogical institute teacher

> Enthusiasm and skills of the teachers, their profound knowledge of certain teaching methods, students co-operation and willingness. Desire to try something new, piloting ideas.
>
> teacher trainer

> 1. We manage to make each student work thoroughly, if necessary we work with some of them after classes.
> 2. Students read much fiction--good English and American literature, both for "home-reading" and "individual reading." We try to connect, to compare the facts and problems raised in the book with the realities of our life.
> 3. There are quite a lot of students who are interested in linguistic research and doing some.
> 4. Extra-curricular activities, especially amateur performances in the foreign language they study.
>
> pedagogical institute teacher

> The desire of students to learn English. I think the present situation in the country is the greatest strength because the openness of the country is the best motivation for learning English. Before that, learning English was sort of "art for art's sake." One more thing which has a lot of drawbacks but nevertheless worked: this country had one and the same programme for language teaching in all pedagogical institutions. It was no good for institutes with highly qualified staff but it helped lower-grade institutions to know at least what were the requirements to the level of the knowledge and language capability.
>
> pedagogical institute teacher

> Because they [EFL courses] exist. You see, English has become very popular among Russian people. Now, they can not only see the American or English people, but speak to them. More visitors come to this country and our town. Our children are eager to meet them and make friends. That is one reason of learning language better. Also many children watch American films and they want to know what the main characters speak about. They are interested in your culture, literature, lifestyle. I can name more reasons, but to my mind, it's clear why some pupils are eager to learn English.

primary/secondary school teacher

> First of all it's [the] high qualification of our teachers, their devotion to the cause of teaching. Besides, I think it is effective enough to use different methods [in] one and the same course--the teacher tries to make studying more interesting and less boring by using various ways of representing this or that material, by making the process realistic and lively. Most of our foreign language teachers care (unfortunately not all of them).
>
> pedagogical institute teacher

> There is some difficulty in teaching students of physical culture institute. They have to train much and often come to the classes tired. I try to make them forget that they are being taught. It's necessary to make a good job before and during the classes to draw and hold their attention, but I do my best and use all the devices available especially those of the intensive method. The result is that I keep them speaking, reading and writing English with pleasure and without being afraid of errors. Why should we spend so much time in doing that? Maybe you know that education is free of charge in our country and motivation to study isn't strong enough. These circumstances taken into consideration I consider that making students learn eagerly is the greatest strength of my courses.
>
> physical culture institute teacher

Finally, Table 11 summarizes what teachers felt to be the greatest problems or challenges they faced in teaching EFL. Almost three-quarters mentioned the lack of authentic materials. This need has assumed primary importance because of the changes in the political situation. There was a national curriculum and series of texts for teaching EFL in the primary/secondary schools prior to *perestroika*, but most teachers now find these materials unacceptable because of the communist ideology they contain.

(Insert Table 11 about here)

The second most urgently felt need, mentioned by just over half of the respondents, is for contact with native speakers of English. This need is also reflected in the desire for opportunities to travel and student abroad, mentioned by almost 45% of the teachers. Feeling a lack of knowledge about the culture of the English-speaking world is also a reflection of their isolation. Ironically, before *perestroika*, when transportation was heavily subsidized by the government, most

teachers could not obtain permission to travel abroad; now that they have freedom to travel, few can afford it.

Almost 50% regretted the lack of equipment, such as copiers, video cameras and playback units, computers, etc.[11] A little over a fourth noted classroom constraints having to do with their course load, the time students had available for studying, etc.

Forty-five percent of the teachers indicated a desire to improve their teaching methodology, and a little over 30% would like increased professional contact with colleagues locally and internationally. Interestingly, only three teachers mentioned low pay and two low prestige, two areas of great concern to many ESL/EFL teachers (Brown, 1992). On the other hand, two teachers mentioned frustration with students' low motivation to learn a foreign language, something many foreign language teachers in the U.S., especially in the secondary schools, may also struggle with.

Conclusion

The results of this survey show how much EFL teachers in Russia and Ukraine share in common with their colleagues in other parts of the world. While much of their approach appears to involve traditional methods and activities, they also use a wide variety of more communicative techniques. Although currently lacking good textbooks and equipment, they are resourceful, flexible, innovative, and enthusiastic about their teaching. Their comments reveal a strong commitment to their students and their profession.

It is hoped that EFL teachers in the former Soviet Union will have opportunities for further contact with colleagues in other countries, as all stand to benefit from such interaction. As one pedagogical institute teacher from Siberia put it:

> We do need cooperation with EFL teachers from other countries; there's much for us to learn, and we have some experience to share.

Endnotes

1. This paper is a revised version of a presentation given at the Rocky Mountain Regional TESOL IX meeting, November 28, 1992. I would like to thank those EFL teachers and teacher educators in the former Soviet Union who responded to the survey. I express my gratitude to Joy Reid, who helped design the survey instrument and provided helpful comments and support during all phases of this study. I would also like to acknowledge the assistance of John Schmidt, Evelyn Hatch, and Greg Orr in the data collection, and Jeri Wyn Gillie in the data analysis for this study. Thanks are also due to Lynn Henrichsen, and Tanya and Yuri Tretyakov who read and commented on drafts of this report. I take responsibility for any errors.

2. It should be noted that a fast-growing segment of the TEFL field in the former Soviet Union was not covered by the survey, namely newly emerging private universities and language schools. These schools may differ in important ways (e.g., in terms of student motivation, teaching methodology, textbooks) from more traditional institutions (Yuri Tretyakov, EFL teacher, St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, personal communication).

3. Numbers in parentheses refer to survey questions, as displayed in Appendix A.

4. Unfortunately, because teachers typically taught more than one type of EFL class, and this question didn't allow for multiple responses or distinguishing the relative emphasis of different classes, we were unable to use the data for this question in our analysis. The survey was subsequently revised to allow for a separate response for each course taught.

5. It should be noted that in most cases an undergraduate degree in the former Soviet Union requires five years to complete.

6. In this and subsequent tables percentages do not add up to 100 percent because individuals gave responses in more than one category.

7. Unfortunately, little information was available regarding what influenced teachers to use a particular method over another. The British Council has been holding seminars in EFL teaching for many years in former Soviet Union, though it has only been since the country began to open up in 1985 that they have been able to take on a much more active role. The U.S. Information Agency has only recently begun to carry out similar work in the area. Hence, the methods used by current EFL teachers have mostly likely been influenced by the work of both local and international language teaching experts.

8. Upon reading a draft of this report, a Russian EFL teacher commented that the term "complex" is more appropriate to describe this combination of methods as "eclectic" may connote a poorly considered mixture of methods in Russian TEFL circles (Yuri Tretyakov, personal communication). The term "eclectic" has been retained in the report, however, because it is more familiar than "complex" to most TEFL professionals in the West.

9. Professor Ignatova is an EFL textbook writer and teacher trainer at the Academy of National Economy in Moscow.

10. The intent was to choose the top ten activities in each of the four categories (i.e., *use very often, use regularly, use occasionally, never use*); however, the number of activities listed was expanded whenever activities shared the same rank in terms of frequency or percentage.

11. At our seminars, some teachers had to go to great lengths to obtain permission to copy a few pages from the texts we brought. Others copied out passages by hand.

References

Brown, J. D. (1992). The biggest problems TESOL members see facing ESL/EFL teachers today. *TESOL Matters*, *2*, 1.

Lozanov, G. (1978). *Suggestology and outlines of suggestopedy* (Hall-Pozharlieva, M. & Pashmakova, K., Trans.). New York: Gordon and Breach Publishers.

Lozanov, G. and Gateva, E. (1988). *The foreign language teacher's suggestopedic manual*. New York: Gordon and Breach Publishers.

Table 1
Geographic Distribution of Respondents

COUNTRY, CITY	FREQ.	%	COUNTRY, CITY	FREQ.	%
Russia	33	62.6	Ukraine	18	34.0
Barnaul	21	39.6	Kiev	11	20.8
Biysk	3	5.7	Dniepropetrovsk	2	3.8
St. Petersburg	2	3.8	Other cities[2]	5	9.4
Other cities[1]	7	13.5	Kazakhstan	1	1.9
			Belorussia	1	1.9

[1]One respondent from each of the following cities in Russia: Gorno-Altaisk, Lipetsk, Moscow, Norgorod, Novosibirsk, Vladimir, and Voronezh

[2]One respondent from each of the following cities in Ukraine: Izmail, Kherson, Lvov (region), Ternopol, and Zhitomir

Table 2 (Question 2)
Role of Department/Institution

ROLE	FREQ.	%
Trains Public School Teachers in EFL	36	67.9
Teaches English to Children	8	15.4
ESP, Post Graduates, Adult Education	5	9.6
Teaches FL Including EFL to University Students	5	9.6
Trains Interpreters and Translators	5	9.6
Trains University Level FL Teachers	1	1.9

Table 3 (Question 3)
Types of Degree/Certification Offered

DEGREE/CERTIFICATION	FREQ.	%
Undergraduate/MA	40	78.4
Secondary School	8	15.7
Certificate, Refresher Course, Post Graduate	5	9.8
Ph.D.	1	2.0

Table 4 (Question 8)
Methods of Teaching

METHOD	FREQ.	%
Communicative	21	55.3
Traditional	12	31.6
Eclectic	9	23.7
Audio-Visual	8	21.1
Audiolingual	7	18.4
Intensive, Suggestopedia	4	10.6
Functional	3	7.9
Content Based	3	7.9
Discussion	2	5.3
Counseling-Learning	1	2.6
Total Physical Response	1	2.6

Table 5 (Question 6)
Activities Used *Very Often* in EFL Courses

ACTIVITY	FREQ.	%[1]
Pair work	23	45.1
Teacher-student drills	17	34.7
Correcting homework	17	34.0
Pronunciation drills	16	33.3
Translate native language to English	16	31.4
Oral translation	16	31.4
Free conversation	16	31.4
Small group work	16	31.4
Class discussion	15	28.8
Student to student drills	14	28.0
Reading fiction	14	28.0
Translate English to native language	14	27.5

[1]Percentages in Tables 5-8 were calculated on the basis of how many subjects had actually responded to an item. Since not all subjects responded to every item, percentages may be slightly different for instances of the same frequency.

Table 6 (Question 6)
Activities Used *Regularly* in EFL Courses

ACTIVITY	FREQ..	%
Meaningful grammar drills	31	66.0
Review of previous material	30	58.8
Out of class composition	28	54.9
Reading aloud	27	54.0
Testing	27	52.9
Translate English to native language	26	51.0
Student-student drills	25	50.0
Translate native language to English	25	49.0
Story retelling	25	49.0
Class discussion	25	48.1
Pre-reading activities	24	49.0
Dictation	24	49.0
Written translation	24	47.1

Table 7 (Question 6)
Activities Used *Occasionally* in EFL Courses

ACTIVITY	FREQ.	%
One-on-one teacher-student	28	57.1
In-class competition	27	54.0
Drama	26	52.0
Silent reading	25	50.0
Free writing	25	50.0
Skimming	24	51.1
Debates	24	48.0
Brainstorming	23	46.9
Mechanical grammar drills	22	46.8
Teacher lectures	21	42.0
Cooperative learning projects	20	46.5
Scanning	20	43.5
Reading non-fiction	20	40.8
Language games	20	46.5
Songs	20	38.5

Table 8 (Question 6)
Activities *Never* Used in EFL Courses

ACTIVITY	FREQ.	%
Dialog Journal	36	80.0
Quick Writing	26	51.0
Research Paper	23	45.1
Semantic Mapping	21	47.7
Copying Text	20	40.8
Cooperative Learning Projects	16	37.2
Free Writing	15	30.0
Peer Feedback Activities	13	34.2
Brainstorming	13	26.5
Cloze Exercises	12	29.3
In-Class Competition	12	24.0

Table 9 (Question 9)
How Students Are Evaluated

METHOD OF EVALUATION	FREQ.	%
Exams	48	98.0
Term, Research Papers	25	51.0
Translations	22	44.9
Essays, Compositions	12	24.5
Dictation	10	20.4
Summary/Reproduction	7	14.3
Monologues	6	12.2
Free Discussion	5	10.2
Dialogues	5	10.2
Quizzes	5	10.2

Table 10 (Question 10)
Greatest Strengths of EFL Courses

STRENGTH	FREQ.	%
Courses/methods	23	59.0
Teacher enthusiasm	11	28.2
Student motivation and skill	10	25.6
Teacher skill	8	20.5
Activities	8	20.5
Teacher desire to try new things	3	7.7

Table 11 (Questions 11-14)
Challenges Facing EFL Teachers in Your Country

CHALLENGE	FREQ.	%
Lack of authentic materials	35	74.5
Lack of contact with native speakers	26	55.3
Lack of equipment	23	48.9
Need to improve current methodology	21	44.7
Lack of opportunities to travel and study abroad	21	44.7
Desire for increased professional contact	15	31.9
Classroom constraints	13	27.7
Lack of knowledge about target culture	9	19.1
Low pay	3	6.4
Low pupil motivation to learn a foreign language	2	4.3
Low prestige	2	4.3

TEFL TEACHER SURVEY

[Demographic info: Name, Title, Job Description, Institution, Address, Phone, Fax]

1. What is the nature of the institution in which you teach?
(Example: The Pedagogical Institute trains public school teachers in all fields, including EFL.)
2. What is the role of your department (or faculty) within the institution?
(Example: The English Department is located within the Foreign Languages Faculty and is responsible for improving the English skills of prospective secondary school EFL teachers.)
3. What degree(s) are your students pursuing? Please include the amount of time required to obtain the degree.
(Example: Undergraduate degree - 5 years)
4. What is the average number of students per class in the courses you teach?

5. What percentage of time do you spend on each of the following topics or skills? (Total time should add up to 100%.) Under "OTHER" you may identify additional topics.

_____ grammar	_____ speaking	_____ other:
_____ vocabulary	_____ listening	_____ other:
_____ pronunciation	_____ reading	_____ other:
_____ culture	_____ writing	_____ other:

6. Please identify the activities carried out in your EFL courses. Use the following code to indicate how much time is spent on a given activity. Write "NA" ("Not Applicable") if you do not use a particular activity.

0 = never use 1 = use occasionally 2 = use regularly 3 = use very often

_____ teacher lecture	_____ in-class composition	_____ problem solving
_____ teacher-student drills	_____ out-of-class composition	_____ cooperative learning projects
_____ student-student drills	_____ dialog journal	_____ translate--Engl./native lang.
_____ class discussion	_____ research paper	_____ translate--native lang./Engl.
_____ one-on-one teacher-student	_____ peer feedback activities	_____ oral translation
_____ pair work	_____ pre-reading activities	_____ written translation
_____ small group work	_____ reading fiction	_____ dictation
_____ role-plays	_____ reading nonfiction	_____ copying text
_____ drama	_____ reading aloud	_____ review of previous material
_____ simulations	_____ silent reading	_____ mechanical grammar drills
_____ debates	_____ skimming	_____ meaningful grammar drills
_____ language games	_____ scanning	_____ communicative gram. activity
_____ songs	_____ cloze exercises	_____ brainstorming
_____ student monologues	_____ correcting homework	_____ story-telling
_____ free conversation	_____ listen + perform actions	_____ testing
_____ free writing	_____ listen + take notes	_____ listening to lab tapes and repeating
_____ quick writing	_____ repeat + learn dialogs	
_____ semantic mapping	_____ pronunciation drills	

7. Please describe other activities which you use that were not listed above, and/or add comments about the activities marked above.

8. What language teaching method/s do you use? Please describe each one briefly.

9. How are your students evaluated? *(Examples: Exams, term papers, translations, etc.)* Please describe in detail.

10. What do you feel are the greatest strengths of your EFL courses?

11. What could be improved in your EFL courses?

12. What do you consider to be the single biggest problem facing EFL teachers in your country?

13. What other challenges does an EFL teacher face in your country?

14. Please add any other comments you would like to make:

Biographical details:

Mary Lee Scott received a PhD in Applied Linguistics from the University of California at Los Angeles. She is involved in language teacher education at Brigham Young University, and has given lectures and workshops on language teaching and testing in Zaire, Cameroon, Hungary, Russia, and Ukraine.

Subject index: language teaching methods, TEFL survey, Russia, Ukraine